United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460

Water Compliance Inspection Report

Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

Transaction Code	NPDES	yr/mo/day	Inspection Type	Inspector	Fac Type
1 N	WA4000573	120222	=	R	3

Remarks: 21 UNPERMITTED 66

Inspection Work Days	Facility Self-Monitoring Evaluation Rating	BI	QA	Reserved
67 10 69	70	71	72	73 74 75 80

Section B: Facility Data

Name and Location of Facility Inspected *(For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number)*	Entry Time/Date	Permit Effective Date
Postma Dairy 4002 Morgan Rd Sumas, WA 98295	9:30AM 02/22/12	Unpermitted
	Exit Time/Date	Permit Expiration Date
	11:00AM 02/22/12	Unpermitted

Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s)	Other Facility Data *(e.g., SIC NAICS, and other descriptive information)*
Les Postma Operator (b) (6)	SIC 0241 Dairy Farms

Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number	Contacted
Dean Postma Owner 4002 Morgan Rd Sumas, WA 98295 (b) (6)	☑ Yes ☐ No

Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection *(Check only those areas evaluated)*

☐ Permit	☐ Self-Monitoring Program	☐ Pretreatment	☐ MS4
☐ **Records/Reports**	☐ Compliance Schedules	☐ Pollution Prevention	
☑ Facility Site Review	☐ Laboratory	☐ Storm Water	
☐ Effluent/Receiving Waters	☑ Operations & Maintenance	☐ Combined Sewer Overflow	
☐ Flow Measurement	☐ Sludge Handling/Disposal	☐ Sanitary Sewer Overflow	

Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

(Attach additional sheets of narrative and checklists, including Single Event Violation codes, as necessary)

SEV Codes SEV Description

RECEIVED
FEB 27 2012
Inspection & Enforcement Management Unit (IEMU)

Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s)	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
Jon Klemesrud	EPA R10 206 553-5068	02/27/2012
Dave Terpening	EPA R10 206 553-6905	02/27/2012
Brian Levo	EPA R10 206 553-1816	02/27/2012
Signature of Management Q A Reviewer	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
	EPA/OCE 206-553-5317	3/16/12

EPA Form 3560-3 (Rev 1-06) Previous editions are obsolete.

ICIS/PCS
2-27-2012
YJBrown

INSTRUCTIONS

Section A: National Data System Coding *(i.e., PCS)*

Column 1: Transaction Code: Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No. Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc.. *(Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary.)*

Columns 12-17: Inspection Date. Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

Column 18: Inspection Type*. Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

- A Performance Audit
- B Compliance Biomonitoring
- C Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling)
- D Diagnostic
- F Pretreatment (Follow-up)
- G Pretreatment (Audit)
- I Industrial User (IU) Inspection
- J Complaints
- M Multimedia
- N Spill
- O Compliance Evaluation (Oversight)
- P Pretreatment Compliance Inspection
- R Reconnaissance
- S Compliance Sampling
- U IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit
- X Toxics Inspection
- Z Sludge - Biosolids
- # Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling
- $ Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling
- + Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling
- & Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling
- \ CAFO-Sampling
- = CAFO-Non-Sampling
- 2 IU Sampling Inspection
- 3 IU Non-Sampling Inspection
- 4 IU Toxics Inspection
- 5 IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment
- 6 IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment
- 7 IU Toxics with Pretreatment
- ! Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight)
- @ Follow-up (enforcement)
- { Storm Water-Construction-Sampling
- } Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling
- : Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling
- ~ Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling
- < Storm Water-MS4-Sampling
- - Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling
- > Storm Water-MS4-Audit

Column 19: Inspector Code. Use one of the codes listed below to describe the *lead agency* in the inspection.

- A — State (Contractor)
- B ---- EPA (Contractor)
- E — Corps of Engineers
- J — Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead
- L ---- Local Health Department (State)
- N — NEIC Inspectors
- O— Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns)
- P— Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns)
- R — EPA Regional Inspector
- S — State Inspector
- T — Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead

Column 20: Facility Type. Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.

- 1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
- 2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
- 3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
- 4 — Federal. Facilities identificd as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
- 5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

Columns 21-66: Remarks. These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days. Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating. Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

Column 71: Biomonitoring Information. Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection. Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

Columns 73-80: These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.

NPDES
Inspection Report

Postma Dairy
Sumas, WA 98295

Prepared by:

Jon Klemesrud
Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
Office of Compliance and Enforcement
Inspection and Enforcement Management Unit

Table of Contents

(Unless otherwise noted, all details in this inspection report were obtained from conversations with Les Postma or from observations during the inspection.

This inspection report includes several attachments including a photograph documentation attachment and aerial diagrams.

I. Facility Information

Facility Name:	Postma Dairy
Facility Contact(s):	Les Postma- Operator Dean Postma- Owner Phone: (b) (6)
SIC Code	0241 Dairy Farms
Facility Location:	4002 Morgan Road Sumas, WA 98295
GPS:	N 48.97555W -122.27005
Mailing Address:	4002 Morgan Road Sumas, WA 98295

II. Inspection Information

Inspection Date:	February 22, 2012
Inspectors:	Jon Klemesrud, Inspector EPA Region 10, OCE / IEMU (206) 553-5068 Dave Terpening, Inspector EPA Region 10, OCE / IEMU (206) 553-6905 Brian Levo, Inspector EPA Region 10, OCE / IEMU (206) 553-1816
Arrival Time: Departure Time:	09:30 AM 11:00 AM
Weather Condition:	Partly Cloudy

Purpose: The inspection was conducted to document the facility's compliance with the Clean Water Act.

III. Permit Information

This facility is currently not covered under the Washington Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State Waste Discharge General Permit.

IV. Background and Activity

The animals kept at this facility include adult milking cows as well as heifers and young stock. The waste generated at this facility is mainly manure and urine deposited in the barn areas. This facility is designed such that the wastes generated are collected, stored and then ultimately land applied on nearby pastures.

Postma Dairy has confined animals in 3 separate locations. The main facility consists of a barn complex where animals are confined, fed, and maintained. It also includes a milk parlor, a silage storage area, a 30,000 gallon below ground waste storage tank, a 1 million gallon above ground waste storage tank, and adjacent pastures. See Attachment A, Aerial Photo #1.

The second location is where the Dairy's young stock are kept. At the time of inspection 50-60 young, non-milking cows were at this location. The young stock facility consists of a barn complex where animals are confined, fed, and maintained. It also includes a 30,000 gallon below ground waste storage tank and adjacent pastures. See Attachment A, Aerial Photo #2

The third location is the Dairy's Heifer facility. At the time of inspection 240-250 heifers were at this location. The Heifer facility consists of a barn complex where animals are confined, fed, and maintained. It also includes a 30,000 gallon below ground waste storage tank, a 2 million gallon storage lagoon and adjacent pastures. See Attachment A, Aerial Photo #3.

V. Individuals Present

The inspectors present throughout this inspection included Jon Klemesrud (EPA), Dave Terpening (EPA), and Brian Levo (EPA).

The facility representative present at the time of the inspection was Mr. Les Postma.

VI. Inspection Entry

This was an unannounced NPDES inspection. Dave Terpening, Brian Levo and I arrived at Postma Dairy at 09:30AM on Wednesday, February 22, 2012 to conduct the inspection.

At this time, Dave, Brian and I identified ourselves as EPA inspectors and presented our credentials to Mr. Postma and gave him a business card. I informed him that the purpose of this visit was to conduct a compliance inspection to determine compliance with the Clean Water Act.

Mr. Postma did not deny us access to the facility. He accompanied us throughout the inspection.

VII. Inspection Chronology

Upon arriving at the facility we began the inspection with an opening conference where we discussed the purpose and expectations of the inspection. During this time we also asked Mr. Postma a few administrative questions.

We then conducted a facility tour where we inspected all three confinement areas and all waste storage facilities.

We then concluded the inspection with a closing conference where I discussed the areas of concern I identified during the inspection.

VIII. Owner and Operator Information

According to Mr. Les Postma, he is the operator of the dairy. His father Dean Postma is the owner.

IX. Number of Animals

According to Mr. Postma, this facility housed approximately 450 milking cows, 240-250 heifers and 50-60 young stock at the time of inspection.

X. Presence of Vegetation in the Confinement Areas

The confinement areas at this facility consist of barns with concrete floors. I did not see any vegetation in any of the confinement areas.

XI. Length of Animal Confinement

According to the Mr. Postma, animals are confined year-round.

XII. Waste Management Process

Waste generated at this facility is mainly from the barns where the animals are confined.

The scraped manure, contaminated water and milk house and parlor wastewater are collected in below ground waste storage tanks. This waste is then transferred into the above ground storage tank and hauled to the lagoon in a 4250 gallon tanker truck or land applied.

XIII. Receiving Water

The receiving water with the highest risk at this facility is the Sumas River, located roughly 50 ft from the waste storage lagoon at the Postma Heifer facility.

XIV. Areas of Concern

We inspected the facility including the confinement areas and the waste handling systems. No discharge was observed during the inspection however I saw one area of concern. This area of concern is described as follows:

A. Lagoon Capacity: At the time of inspection the facility's 2 million gallon waste storage lagoon was near maximum capacity. Roughly 2 inches of freeboard was remaining. This lagoon sits elevated about 50ft from the Sumas River. See Attachment B, Photo #1, Photo #2

Mr. Postma stated he will not be adding anymore waste to the lagoon. Additional waste generated will be stored in the above ground waste storage tank which was verified to have about 12ft of additional storage in the 1 million gallon tank.

XV. Closing Conference

A closing conference was held following the inspection. During the closing conference I discussed the area of concern identified above.

Report Completion Date: 03/15/17

Lead Inspector Signature:

ATTACHMENT A

Aerial Photographs

PHOTO # 1

PHOTO #2

PHOTO #3

ATTACHMENT B

Photograph Documentation

Postma Dairy
All photographs taken by Dave Terpening on February 22, 2012

Photo No. 1
Facing West, photo showing the waste storage lagoon at the time of inspection..

Photo No. 2
Facing East, photo showing the waste storage lagoon's proximity to the Sumas River. The Sumas River is located down slope to the left of the trees about 50 ft away.